

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-24, 26, and 28-37 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 18, 19, 26, 28, and 29 have been amended. Claims 7, 9, 25, and 27 have been cancelled. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Abstract

The abstract was objected to. Applicant has amended the abstract to address the Examiner's objection and a replacement abstract reflecting the amendments is attached, as required. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Friedli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,319,966). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed in Applicant's earlier response, claim 1 relates to a system which facilitates storage and searching of surveillance footage for a transportation device. In an embodiment, the transportation device is an elevator. The system captures video or audio information about a person using the transportation device (e.g. a person in an elevator). It also captures information about the status of the transportation device. For example, where the transportation is an elevator, the system may capture what floor the elevator is at, whether it is travelling upwards or downwards, and other status information.

This enables an entity, such as a security officer, to search the stored information and determine the status of the transport device relative to the video/audio information that has been captured.

Capturing elevator status information and associating it with captured video/audio information provides advantages. For example, one can determine where and when an intruder is relative to the status of a transport device such as an elevator. This is not disclosed in the prior art of record, including Friedli.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of claims 7 and 9, such that claim 1 clearly recites that the captured video and audio information of the person using the transport device is stored in a storage means which can be accessed by an entity to search the information and determine the status of the transport device relative to the video/audio information captured. Accordingly, it is clear that the system includes means for storing and searching surveillance footage (see, paragraph 4 of the Office Action).

Friedli discloses a system which stores user personal information profiles and information to be communicated. This information is to be communicated to the user of the elevator. The user personal information allows the system to determine what information should be communicated to the user. Friedli is a presentation system, for presenting information (e.g. movies, advertising information) to a user of an elevator, both outside the elevator and in the elevator on presentation devices such as VDUs. The information may change depending upon the status of the elevator, e.g. floor that the elevator is at. Friedli is a system for pushing information to a user when it has determined who the user is. It is not a surveillance system.

Although Friedli does mention that surveillance cameras can be provided for security personnel (column 3, lines 49 - 51), this is unconnected from the Friedli system for pushing information to the user. There is no disclosure in Friedli that suggests that the surveillance system is anything other than a conventional surveillance system. That is, surveillance may be "real time" by manned security personnel, or it may be stored for subsequent review by security personnel. There is no teaching, however, of associating the surveillance information with a status of the elevator. Applicant submits that the surveillance system disclosed as an aside in Friedli, and is merely a conventional system. Friedli is concerned with a system for presenting various media to occupants of the elevator.

Accordingly, Friedli fails to disclose that the captured video and audio information of the person using the transport device is stored in a storage means which can be accessed by an entity to search the information and determine the status of the transport device relative to the video/audio information captured, as recited in amended claim 1.

Claim 19 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 because claim 19 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 8, 10-18, 20-24, 26, and 28-37 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 19 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1 and 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

By:



Vishal V. Khatri
Registration No. 51,873
Direct No. (202) 879-3607

Intellectual Property Group
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 879-3939 Telephone
(202) 626-1700 Facsimile

Date: August 20, 2010

Attachment: Replacement Abstract